

REMARKS

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to claims 6 and 13-18 due to the phrase "the end of the unit remote from said first end", as not having proper antecedent basis. This phrase has been amended to "one end of the unit". It is believed that this objection has been overcome.

At pages 2-4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homer et al. (US Patent No. 6,487,081) in view of Ozias et al. (US Patent No. 6,556,431). Moreover, at page 4, claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homer et al. in view of Ozias et al., and further in view of Lakoski et al. (US Patent No. 4,898,009). At pages 4-7, claims 5-10, 13, 14, 17-20, 23-26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homer et al. in view of Ozias et al., and further in view of Babson et al. (US Patent No. 4,937,806). At page 7, claims 15, 16, 21, 22, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homer et al. in view of Ozias et al., in view of Babson and further in view of Lakoski. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

First, all rejections are based on Homer et al., which is filed on December 29, 2000, which is later than the priority date of the present application (February 14, 2000). The present application is a divisional application based on US Serial No. 09/782,720, which claims foreign priority from the corresponding EPO application filed on February 14, 2000. Thus, the present application has an invention date of at least February 14, 2000.

The Applicant believes that the rejections have been overcome by this reason alone.

Moreover, none of the cited references, either standing alone or combined together, discloses or suggests the following limitations of claim 1 of the present application:

“a displayless and keyboardless system unit having a sealed housing comprising main processing functionality for executing application programs and at least a DC-DC converter, the housing being provided with external connectors for connection to said external user input and display devices”;

“the housing having a recessed portion for receiving the removable data storage device and a movable closure member for enclosing the recessed portion”; and

“an external power supply having a flying lead connectable to an external socket provided in the housing for supplying DC power to the DC-DC converter”.

One important feature of the claimed invention is that the data storage unit (typically, the hard disk), the power supply and the sealed housing of a computer are made into **separately replaceable units** so that each of the three units can be added, upgraded, or replaced in very simple procedures (see e.g. page 2, lines 26-31 and page 5, lines 22-27 of the specification). The objective is that users of such computer can upgrade the computer or fix defective parts with minimum knowledge or no knowledge at all about the internal design or configuration of the computer (see e.g. page 1, lines 10-36 of the specification). None of the computers in the cited references are designed to achieve this objective. Furthermore, the cited

references, standing alone or combined, do not teach all limitations of the claimed invention.

Homer et al. discloses a generic mounting structure for mounting a hard disk drive. In Homer et al., the computers being used are ordinary computers. If a user wishes to upgrade the computers or fix a defective part, he has to be familiar with the structure of the computers; otherwise service from a computer technician would be needed.

Homer et al. does not teach that the computer has a **“sealed”** housing, as recited by claim 1 of the present application. As defined at page 2, lines 33-34 of the present application, the housing “is sealed in the sense that it is not intended that a user needs to open the housing during the life of the product.” Usually the housing of a computer can be opened.

Moreover, the Applicant believes that Homer et al. does not disclose “a DC-DC converter” or “supplying DC power to the DC-DC converter”, as recited by claim 1 of the present application. At pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Homer et al. discloses such feature. In fact, Homer et al. only discloses an **AC-DC converter, not a DC-DC converter.**

Ozias discloses an electronic device to employ an AC adapter while limiting the sacrificing of valuable component space and minimizing the risk of component harm resulting from the AC adapter's operation. Again, Ozias does not teach that the computer has a “sealed” housing, as recited by claim 1 of the present application. Ozias's computer is apparently openable.

Moreover, Ozias does not teach a DC-DC converter, only an AC-DC converter.

Similarly, the other cited references (Lakoski et al. and Babson et al.) also fail to teach the above-cited features of claim 1. For example, in Lakoski et al. and Babson et al., the computer housing is not “**sealed**” in the sense that it is not intended that a user needs to open the housing during the life of the product. Lakoski et al. and Babson et al. do not teach that the power supply is separate or external from the main body and supplies DC power to the main body of the computer. Lakoski et al. and Babson et al. also do not teach that the data storage device (such as the hard disk) is removably mounted in a recessed portion of the housing.

Under MPEP 2143, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Since the cited references fail to teach or suggest all limitations of claim 1, as discussed above, the Applicant believes that claim 1 is patentable. Similarly, the features discussed above are basically recited by all independent claims of the present application. Thus, none of the claims are anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited references.

The Applicant has attempted to address all of the issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action as the Applicant understands them. It is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance. If any point requires further explanation, the Examiner is invited to telephone Troy Cai at (323) 934-2300 or e-mail Troy Cai at tcai@ladasparry.com.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which

may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account No. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

Enclosed please find a copy of Troy Guangyu Cai's Notice of Limited Recognition under 35 CFR 10.9(b) to prepare and prosecute patent applications wherein the patent applicant is a client of Ladas & Parry, and the attorney of record in the applications is a registered practitioner who is a member of Ladas & Parry.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 2, 2004

(Date of Deposit)

Troy Guangyu Cai

(Name of Person Signing)



(Signature)

7/2/04

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Troy Guangyu Cai

Attorney for Applicant

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300